Sparse Recovery Analysis of Preconditioned Frames via Convex Optimization

Pradip Sasmal, Prasad Theeda, Phanindra Jampana and C. S. Sastry

arXiv:1604.06615v3 [math.OC] 11 Feb 2017

***Abstract*—Orthogonal Matching Pursuit and Basis Pursuit are popular reconstruction algorithms for recovery of sparse signals. The exact recovery property of both the methods has a relation with the coherence of the underlying redundant dictionary, i.e. a frame. A frame with low coherence provides better guarantees for exact recovery. An equivalent formulation of the associated linear system is obtained via premultiplication by a non-singular matrix. In view of bounds that guarantee sparse recovery, it is very useful to generate the preconditioner in such way that the preconditioned frame has low coherence as compared to the original. In this paper, we discuss the impact of preconditioning on sparse recovery. Further, we formulate a convex optimization problem for designing the preconditioner that yields a frame with improved coherence. In addition to reducing coherence, we focus on designing well conditioned frames and numerically study the relationship between the condition number of the preconditioner and the coherence of the new frame. Alongside theoretical justifications, we demonstrate through simulations the efficacy of the preconditioner in reducing coherence as well as recovering sparse signals.**

***Index Terms*—Compressed Sensing, Convex Optimization, Incoherent frames, Pre-conditioning, Semidefinite Programming, Unit Norm Tight Frames.**

I. Introduction

Compressed Sensing (CS) [21], [23], [24], [25], [41] has emerged as a powerful and effective tool towards producing sparse signal representations. CS provides stable recovery of a sparse signal form an under-determined linear system of equations. Performance of several sparse recovery algorithms like Basis Pursuit (BP) and Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP) depends on the coherence of the underlying frame. Frames that satisfy the Restricted Isometry Property (RIP) [26], [27] are known to allow for exact recovery of sparse signals from a few of their linear measurements. However, in general, it is computationally hard to verify the Restricted Isometry Property (RIP) of a given frame. In contrast, the coherence (the largest absolute normalized inner product between two distinct columns) of a frame is an easily computable quantity that asserts RIP up to certain order [28].

Frames with small coherence are said to be incoherent. For a fixed number of elements, frames with the smallest coherence are called Grassmannian [5]. The lowest bound on the minimal achievable correlation for any frame, known as Welch bound [14], is given by $\sqrt{\frac{M-m}{m(M-1)}}$, where m is the dimension of the ambient space and M is the number of frame elements. Incoherent frames and especially Incoherent Unit Norm Tight Frames (UNTFs) play a significant role due to their ability in providing stable, sparse representations and effectiveness in the construction of signature sequences in CDMA systems [8], [9]. However, construction of such frames is known to be very difficult.

In [22], [23], J. Tropp et.al., and M. Elad have used an alternating projection method to produce incoherent frames. In [33], [34], C. Rusu et. al., have proposed a convex optimization technique applied on a random Gaussian matrix for designing incoherent frames. In [12], B. G. Bodmann et. al. have constructed UNTFs by differential equation based techniques. P. G. Casazza et. al. [13] have used a gradient descent algorithm for realizing UNTFs. In [35], E. Tsiligianni et. al. have proposed an iterative process on the Gram matrix of Φ to obtain an incoherent UNTF.

In [36], a preconditioning technique has been employed to design an incoherent unit norm frame via shrinkage operation on the off-diagonal entries of the Gram matrix of Φ and the incoherent unit norm frame so obtained is near to an UNTF. The technique may be summarized as follows: the initial frame Φ is premultiplied by a Gaussian matrix G followed by a normalization step. Then the Gram matrix H of $G\Phi$ is formed and the shrinkage operation, decimating the entries above $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ in magnitude, is applied on H to form H'. Subsequently, the premultiplier Φ'' is obtained from $H'' = (\Phi'')^T\Phi''$, where H'' is the best rank-m approximation of H'. This process is repeated iteratively for generating incoherent frames. This method, however, is not known to provide theoretical guarantees for the convergence of the iterative process.

In many applications, the sensing matrix may not match with the incoherent frames developed by existing methods mentioned above. While these methods focus on constructing incoherent frames directly, we approach this problem from the perspective of an already existing linear system and develop incoherent frames via preconditioning.

Coherence of $G\Phi$ is in general a non-convex function in G for a given frame Φ. However, under the condition that $G\Phi$ is a unit norm frame, the optimization problem becomes tractable (in fact, it becomes a semi-definite program (SDP)). In the case of noisy observations, in addition to small coherence, it is also desirable to obtain

P. Sasmal, P. Theeda and C. Sastry are with the Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology, Hyderabad

Phanindra Jampana is with the Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, Hyderabad

Manuscript received ABCD; revised CDEF.

a preconditioner which has a small condition number. This problem can also be formulated as an SDP. Besides formulating the SDP problems, in this paper, we also give a sufficient condition for the existence of an invertible G so that there is a strict fall in coherence, i.e. $\mu(G\Phi) < \mu(\Phi)$. The condition can be verified by checking a linear system of equations for infeasibility.

Preconditioning may affect the performance guarantees of OMP but BP remains unaffected. However, the existing coherence based bounds for BP can be enlarged using the idea of preconditioning. In the case where G is diagonal, results from frame theory give analytical conditions for strict fall in coherence as opposed to the sufficient conditions in the general case.

The paper is organized in several sections. In Section 2, we provide basics of frame theory and compressed sensing. In Sections 3 and 4, we present the effect of preconditioning on sparse recovery algorithms and our proposed convex optimization method respectively. In Sections 5 and 6, we study respectively the analysis of optimal solution of the semidefinite programming (SDP) problem and the proposed convex optimization to obtain preconditioner in noisy cases. In Section 7, we demonstrate our simulation results. The paper ends with concluding remarks in the final section.

II. Basics of Frame theory and Compressed Sensing

A. Frame Theory

Frames are overcomplete spanning systems, which are introduced as a generalization of bases [1], [2], [4], [37]. Frame theory has deep connections with Harmonic analysis, Operator theory, Coding theory [10] and Quantum theory [11]. Due to its widespread applicability, the area of frames has become an active area of research for many researchers from several fields. In signal processing, frames play a significant role in sparse signal recovery [3], [28].

A family of vectors $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$ is called a frame for $\mathbb{R}^m$, if there exist constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ such that

$$A \left\|z\right\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left|\langle z, \phi_i\rangle\right|^2 \leq B \left\|z\right\|^2, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^m, \qquad (1)$$

where A, B are called the lower and upper frame bounds respectively [1]. The matrix $\Phi_{m\times M} = [\phi_1 \dots \phi_M]$ with ϕ_i as columns is known as the frame synthesis operator. The adjoint of synthesis operator Φ is known as analysis operator $\Phi^* = \Phi^T$. The frame operator F_Φ is given by $F_\Phi = \Phi\Phi^T$. In this paper we refer to Φ as a frame and also as a matrix depending on the context. Frames are characterized depending on their properties as outlined below:

- If $A = B$, then $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ is an $A-$tight frame or simply a tight frame.
- If there exists a constant d such that $|\langle \phi_i, \phi_j\rangle| = d$, for $1 \leq i < j \leq M$, then $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ is an equiangular frame.
- If there exits a constant c such that $\left\|\phi_i\right\|_2 = c$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ is an equal norm frame. If $c = 1$, then it is called a unit-norm frame.
- If a frame is both unit norm and tight, it is called a unit norm tight frame (UNTF).
- If a frame is both UNTF and equiangular, it is called an equiangular tight frame (ETF).

UNTFs are an important class of frames as they have good conditioning and provide stable representation. For a given frame Φ, the frame potential is defined by

$$FP(\Phi) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{M} |\langle \phi_i, \phi_j\rangle|^2 = \|H\|_F^2,$$

where $H = \Phi^T\Phi$ and $\| \bullet \|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. For an arbitrary frame Φ, $FP(\Phi) \leq \frac{M^2}{m}$ and equality holds when Φ is a unit norm tight frame. A UNTF $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ exists only for $A = \frac{M}{m}$. ETFs are known as optimal Grasssmanian frames as their coherence touches the Welch bound [14]. It is known that these frames exist only for certain frame dimensions such as $M \leq \frac{m(m+1)}{2}$.

B. Compressed Sensing

The objective of Compressed Sensing (CS) is to recover $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$ from a few of its linear measurements $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ through a stable and efficient reconstruction process via the concept of sparsity. From the measurement vector y and the sensing mechanism, one obtains a system $y = \Phi x$, where Φ is an $m \times M$ $(m < M)$ matrix. Sparsity is measured by $\|\cdot\|_0$ norm where $\|x\|_0 := |\{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\} : x_j \neq 0\}|$. Finding the sparsest solution can be formulated as the following minimization problem,

$$P_0(\Phi, y) : \min_x \|x\|_0 \text{ subject to } \quad \Phi x = y.$$

This is a combinatorial minimization problem and is known to be NP-hard [16]. One may use greedy methods [7] or convex relaxation of $P_0(\Phi, y)$ problem to recover the k-sparse signal x (that is, $\|x\|_0 \leq k$). The convex relaxation of $P_0(\Phi, y)$ problem can be posed as [17], [19],

$$P_1(\Phi, y) : \min_x \|x\|_1 \text{ subject to } \quad \Phi x = y.$$

Candes and Tao [18] have introduced the following isometry condition on matrices Φ and have shown that it results in sufficient conditions for exact recovery. An $m \times M$ matrix Φ is said to satisfy the Restricted Isometry Property (RIP) of order k with constant δ_k $(0 < \delta_k < 1)$ if for all vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $\|x\|_0 \leq k$, we have

$$(1 - \delta_k) \|x\|_2^2 \leq \|\Phi x\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_k) \|x\|_2^2. \qquad (2)$$

Roughly speaking, RIP measures the "overall conditioning" of the set of $m \times k$ submatrices of Φ. Consequently, a smaller δ_k implies better sparse recovery properties. The following theorem [19] establishes the equivalence between P_0 and P_1 problems:

Theorem II.1. *Suppose an $m\times M$ matrix Φ has the $(2k, \delta)$ restricted isometry property with $\delta < \sqrt{2} - 1$, then P_0 and*

P_1 have the same $k-$sparse solution if P_0 has a $k-$sparse solution.

The coherence of Φ is given by

$$\mu(\Phi) = \max_{1\leq i,j\leq M,\, i\neq j} \frac{|\ \phi_i^T \phi_j|}{\|\phi_i\|_2 \|\phi_j\|_2}.$$

The following proposition [16] relates δ_k and μ.

Proposition II.2. *Suppose that $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_M$ are the unit norm columns of the matrix Φ with coherence μ. Then Φ satisfies RIP of order k with constant $\delta_k = (k-1)\mu$.*

The above relation indicates that our desire to have smaller δ_k is achievable by producing matrices with smaller coherence. It is to be noted however that there exist fundamental limitations in constructing matrices with large RIP orders using coherence based arguments [16].

Coherence based techniques are used in establishing the guaranteed recovery of sparse signals via Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP) or Basis Pursuit (BP), as summarized by the following result [20].

Theorem II.3. *An arbitrary $k-$sparse signal x can be uniquely recovered as a solution to problems $P_0(\Phi, y)$ (using OMP) and $P_1(\Phi, y)$, provided*

$$k < \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu(\Phi)}\right). \tag{3}$$

III. Effect of preconditioning on OMP and BP

For a non-singular matrix G, the linear system $\Phi x = y$ is the same as $G\Phi x = Gy$ and hence the problems $P_0(\Phi, y)$, $P_0(G\Phi, Gy)$ and $P_1(\Phi, y)$, $P_1(G\Phi, Gy)$ are equivalent respectively.

OMP is an iterative greedy algorithm by nature. It selects at every iteration the frame element which has the maximum correlation with the residual at that step and provides an orthogonal projection of the signal on the space spanned by the already selected frame atoms. In general, when OMP is used, the solutions of $P_0(\Phi, y)$ and $P_0(G\Phi, Gy)$ may not be the same. It can also be noted that the bounds in (3) may also differ as Φ and $G\Phi$ can have different coherences.

In contrast, as $P_1(G\Phi, Gy)$ is typically solved as a linear program, the solutions of $P_1(\Phi, y)$ and $P_1(G\Phi, Gy)$ remain the same. In view of bounds such as (3), one obtains better theoretical guarantee for the system possessing $\tilde{G}\Phi$ as its underlying sensing matrix, where $\tilde{G}$ is given by

$$\tilde{G} = \underset{G \text{ non-singular}}{\arg\min}\ \mu(G\Phi) \tag{4}$$

Consequently, any $k-$sparse solution of $\tilde{G}y = \tilde{G}\Phi x$ can be uniquely recovered whenever

$$k < \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu(\tilde{G}\Phi)}\right).$$

As $P_1(\Phi, y)$ and $P_1(\tilde{G}\Phi, \tilde{G}y)$ are equivalent, this implies that any $k-$sparse solution of $y = \Phi x$ can also be uniquely recovered whenever the above bound is satisfied. This can be summarized by the following theorem.

Theorem III.1. *Let $\tilde{G} = \underset{G \text{ non-singular}}{\arg\min}\ \mu(G\Phi)$ and assume that $\mu_{\tilde{G}\phi}$ is well defined. An arbitrary $k-$sparse signal x can be uniquely recovered as a solution to $P_1(\Phi, y)$, provided*

$$k < \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu(\tilde{G}\Phi)}\right) \tag{5}$$

Proof. If $\tilde{G}$ is non-singular, the proof is trivial. Assuming $\tilde{G}$ is singular, we can obtain a sequence of non-singular matrices G_n so that $G_n \to \tilde{G}$. Hence,

$$k < \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu(G_n\Phi)}\right)\ \forall n = 1, 2, \ldots$$

Applying a limit on both sides and noting that $\mu(G\Phi)$ is continuous in G, we obtain the desired result. □

If the minimum is attained in (4), the bound stated in (5) is applicable to the system $\tilde{G}y = \tilde{G}\Phi x$ in recovering sparse solutions via OMP as well. Nevertheless, in contrast to solving $P_1(\Phi, y)$ using linear programming, OMP used to solve $P_0(\Phi, y)$ where $y = \Phi x, \|x\|_0 \in \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(1+\frac{1}{\mu_\Phi}\right), \frac{1}{2}\left(1+\frac{1}{\mu_{\tilde{G}\Phi}}\right)\right]$ may not recover the solution. In other words, for k lying between the values on the right hand sides of (3) and (5), OMP run on $y = \Phi x$ and $\tilde{G}y = \tilde{G}\Phi x$ may yield different support sets.

IV. Preconditioning via Convex Optimization

In this section, starting from a frame $\Phi = \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$, we discuss our methodology towards designing a suitable preconditioner that acts on Φ to produce a new frame with smaller coherence. Without loss of generality, we assume that Φ is an unit norm frame, that is,

$$\|\phi_i\|_2 = 1, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, M.$$

For a given frame Φ, the problem of finding a preconditioner G that yields an incoherent frame $G\Phi$ may be posed in the following manner:

$$C_0 : \arg\min_G \max_{i\neq j} \frac{|\langle G\phi_i, G\phi_j\rangle|}{\|G\phi_i\|_2 \|G\phi_j\|_2}.$$

It can be noted that C_0 is a non-convex problem in general due to the denominator terms involving G in the expression for coherence. However, with the assumption of unit norm condition,

$$\|G\phi_i\|_2 = 1, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, M.$$

the relaxed C_0 problem, i.e.,

$$C_0' : \min_G \max_{i\neq j} |\langle G\phi_i, G\phi_j\rangle|.$$

becomes tractable. The full classification of preconditioners which preserve the unit norm condition has been discussed in [37].

Theorem IV.1. *Let $\Phi = \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ be an unit norm frame for $\mathbb{R}^m$ and let G be an invertible operator on $\mathbb{R}^m$ such that G^TG has eigen vectors $\mathbb{E} = \{e_j^G\}_{j=1}^m$ with respective eigen values $\{\lambda_j^G\}_{j=1}^m$, then G maps Φ to an unit norm*

frame, that is, $\|G\phi_i\|_2 = 1$ *if and only if* $(\lambda_1^G - 1, \ldots, \lambda_m^G - 1)_{j=1}^m \perp \mathbb{R}(\Phi, \mathbb{E}) = span\{(|\langle \phi_i, e_j^G \rangle|^2)_{j=1}^m\}_{i=1}^M$.

A simple example is any unitary operator U. U maps Φ to a unit norm frame as $\|U\phi_i\|_2 = 1$. However, as $\langle U\phi_i, U\phi_j \rangle = \langle \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle$, $\mu(U\Phi) = \mu(\Phi)$, there is no improvement in coherence.

For a non-singular matrix G, the gram matrix of $G\Phi$ is given by $\Phi^T X \Phi$, where $X = G^T G$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix. We denote the set of symmetric positive definite matrices of order m by S_{++}^m. Let $S_\Phi = \{X \in S_{++}^m : \text{diag}(\Phi^T X \Phi) = \mathbf{1}\} = \{X \in S_{++}^m : \phi_i^T X \phi_i = 1, \forall i = 1, \ldots, M\}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of length M with all its entries equal to unity. It is easy to check that S_Φ is a convex set. Also, $S_\Phi \neq \emptyset$ as $U_m \in S_\Phi$, where U_m is any unitary matrix of size $m \times m$. It can be noted that the coherence of $G\Phi$ is given by

$$c_\Phi^X = \max_{i \neq j} |\phi_i^T X \phi_j|,$$

which is a convex function of X.

The convexity of S_Φ and c_Φ^X motivates us to repose C_0' as:

$$C_1 : \min_{X \in S_\Phi} \max_{i \neq j} |\phi_i^T X \phi_j|;$$

However, as S_Φ may not be closed, C_1 might not have a solution. We relax the set S_Φ so that the feasible region is guaranteed to be closed. A natural way is to consider the class of symmetric semi-positive definite matrices (S_+^m) in the place of symmetric positive definite matrices S_{++}^m. We constitute the following feasible set

$$S_\Phi' = \{X \in S_+^m : \text{diag}(\Phi^T X \Phi) = \mathbf{1}\},$$

which is closed and convex. This consideration allows us to have the following relaxed formulation of C_1,

$$C_1' : \begin{array}{ll} \max\limits_{X,q} & (-q) \\ \text{subject to} & \phi_i^T X \phi_i = 1, \forall i = 1, \ldots, M; \\ & \phi_i^T X \phi_j \leq q, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & \phi_i^T X \phi_j \geq -q, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & X \geq 0 \\ & q \geq 0. \end{array}$$

It may be observed that q acts as the coherence of the matrix $G\Phi$.

Remark IV.2. *Let the Cholesky decomposition of* X *be* $L^T L$*, then the matrix* G *can be obtained as* L*.*

A. Preconditioner producing frame near to an UNTF:

We now focus on obtaining a preconditioner that produces a frame that is near to an UNTF [**?**]. The solution to the nearness problem follows from the following result from frame theory [35].

Theorem IV.3. *For a given frame* $\Psi_{m \times M}$*, suppose the singular value decomposition (SVD) is given by* $\Psi = U\Sigma V^*$ *. With respect to the Frobenius norm, the nearest unique* $\alpha-$*tight frame from* Ψ *is given by* $N_\Psi = \sqrt{\alpha} UV^*$*. One may compute* UV^* *using the formula* $(\Psi\Psi^T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Psi$*.*

Let the SVD of $G\Phi$ (G being obtained by solving C_1 problem) be $G\Phi = U\Sigma V^*$, then the nearest $\frac{M}{m}-$tight frame from $G\Phi$ is given by $N_{G\Phi} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{m}}\right) UV^*$, which is near to an UNTF [36]. Note that if we let $G_1' = \left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{m}}\right) U\Sigma^{-1}U^T$, where Σ^{-1} is obtained from the $m \times m$ principle minor of Σ by replacing the non-zero diagonal entries with their reciprocals then by definition G_1' is non-singular and it is easy to check that $G_1' G\Phi = N_{G\Phi} = G_1\Phi$, where $G_1 = G_1' G$. So $N_{G\Phi}$ can be obtained from Φ by premultiplying with G_1.

B. Diagonal Preconditioner

Before dealing with a general preconditioner G, we first analyze the optimization problem C_1' for diagonal operators that belong to S_Φ. The following theorem is an important observation for such frames.

Theorem IV.4. *For a given frame* Φ*, if the matrix formed by taking square of entries of* Φ *is also a frame, then coherence remains unchanged by action of any diagonal preconditioner that belongs to* S_Φ*.*

Proof. Let us assume that $G = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^G, \ldots, \lambda_m^G) \in S_\Phi$, i.e., $G\Phi$ is a unit norm frame. It is clear that the standard orthonormal vectors $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^m$ of $\mathbb{R}^m$ are the eigen vectors of G corresponding to eigen values $\{\lambda_j^G\}_{j=1}^m$. Then, $\mathbb{R}(\Phi, \mathbb{E}) = \text{span}\{(|\langle \phi_i, e_j^G \rangle|^2)_{j=1}^m\}_{i=1}^M = \text{span}\{\phi_i^2\}_{i=1}^M$, where $\phi_i^2 = (\phi_{1i}^2, \ldots, \phi_{mi}^2)^T$. It is clear that if $\text{span}\{\phi_i^2\}_{i=1}^M = \mathbb{R}^m$, then by Theorem IV.1, I_m is the only diagonal preconditioner that belongs to S_Φ. This completes the proof. □

Therefore, we can hope for improvement in coherence via a diagonal pre-conditioner only when $\text{span}\{\phi_i^2\}_{i=1}^M \neq \mathbb{R}^m$. In that case the problem C_1' can be converted to a linear programming problem (LPP) described below:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max\limits_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \cdots, \sigma_m, q} & (-q) \\ \text{subject to} & \sum\limits_{k=1}^m \sigma_k \phi_{ik}^2 = 1, \forall i = 1, \ldots, M; \\ & -q \leq \sum\limits_{k=1}^m \sigma_k \phi_{ik}\phi_{jk} \leq q, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & \sigma_k \geq 0; \forall k = 1, \ldots, m; \\ & q \geq 0 \end{array}$$

Here, σ_k acts as $(\lambda_k^G)^2$. This formulation can be solved by any existing interior point LPP solvers [39], [40] so that the condition $\sigma_k > 0$ is satisfied in every iteration.

Remark IV.5. *An implication of the previous theorem is that any frame with binary* $0, 1$ *entries, constructed for example in [29], [30], [31], [32], [42]), does not allow for fall in coherence value via diagonal pre-conditioning.*

C. Semi-definite programming (SDP) for general preconditioners:

Adding slack and surplus variables $p_{ij} \geq 0$ and $q_{ij} \geq 0$, we obtain the following equivalent formulation of C_1':

$$C_1'': \begin{array}{ll} \max\limits_{X,q,p_{ij},q_{ij}} & (-q) \\ \text{subject to} & \phi_i^T X \phi_i = 1, \forall i = 1, \ldots, M; \\ & \phi_i^T X \phi_j + p_{ij} - q = 0, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & -\phi_i^T X \phi_j + q_{ij} - q = 0, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & X \geq 0 \\ & q \geq 0 \\ & p_{ij} \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & q_{ij} \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \end{array}$$

For the purpose of analysis later, we define the sets, $D^+(X,q) = \{(i,j) : \phi_i^T X \phi_j = q\}$ and $D^-(X,q) = \{(i,j) : \phi_i^T X \phi_j = -q\}$. It is clear that $p_{ij} = 0$ if $(i,j) \in D^+(X,q)$ and $q_{ij} = 0$ if $(i,j) \in D^-(X,q)$. Let $M' = \frac{M(M-1)}{2}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ denote a zero matrix of size $m \times m$, $\mathbf{0'}$ a square zero matrix of size $M' \times M'$, P a diagonal matrix of size $M' \times M'$ consisting of p_{ij} as diagonal elements, Q a diagonal matrix of size $M' \times M'$ containing q_{ij} as diagonal elements, $\mathbf{1}_{ij}$ a diagonal matrix of size $M' \times M'$ whose diagonal entries are indexed by arranging the tuples (i,j) in lexicographic order for $1 \leq i < j \leq M$ so that it contains 1 at the $(i,j)-$th diagonal element and zero elsewhere. For simplicity in notation, we also let $\phi'_{ij} = \frac{\phi_i \phi_j^T + \phi_j \phi_i^T}{2}$ and define the following block matrices.

$$F_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{0'} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0'} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \; F_{ii} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \phi_i^T & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{0'} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0'} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$F_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi'_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1}_{ij} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0'} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \; Y = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & q \end{pmatrix},$$

$$F_{ji} = \begin{pmatrix} -\phi'_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{0'} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{1}_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to check that, for $1 \leq i < j \leq M$, F_{ii}, F_{ij}, F_{ji} and F_0 are symmetric. C_1'' can be formulated in a standard SDP form [38] as

$$SDP_{\mathbf{C}_1''}: \begin{array}{lllll} \max\limits_{Y} & -Tr(F_0 Y) & & & \\ \text{subject to} & Tr(F_{ii} Y) = 1, & \forall & i = 1, \ldots, M; \\ & Tr(F_{ij} Y) = 0, & \forall & 1 \leq i < j \leq M; \\ & Tr(F_{ji} Y) = 0, & \forall & 1 \leq i < j \leq M, \\ & Y \geq 0 & & & \end{array}$$

The dual of $SDP_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$ is given by :

$$SDPD_{\mathbf{C}_1''}: \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{Z=\{z_{ij}\}} & C_{M''}^T Z \\ \text{subject to} & F_0 + \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} z_{ii} F_{ii} + \sum\limits_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} z_{ij} F_{ij} + \\ & \sum\limits_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} z_{ji} F_{ji} \geq \mathbf{0''} \end{array}$$

where $\mathbf{0''}$ is a square zero matrix of size $M'' = M^2 - M + m + 1$ and $C_{M''}$ is a vector of length M'' whose first M elements are equal to one and rest are zero. $SDP_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$ and $SDPD_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$ can be solved by primal-dual path following methods [38]. In this paper, the simulations are obtained using the SDPT3 solver of CVX toolbox for MATLAB.

V. Analysis of optimal solution

It is easy to check that, with X being the identity matrix, $p_{ij} = 1 - \phi_i^T \phi_j$, $q_{ij} = 1 + \phi_i^T \phi_j$ and $q = 1$, Y becomes a strict feasible solution of $SDP_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$. Similarly, it is easily verified that with $z_{ii} = 1$ and $z_{ij} = z_{ji} = \frac{1}{M^2}$, Z becomes a strict feasible solution of $SDPD_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$. Since both primal and dual have strict feasible solutions, by Strong Duality Theorem [38], optimal values of primal and dual coincide with each other. Consequently, the duality gap is zero for any optimal pair (Y^*, Z^*), where Y^* is an optimal solution for $SDP_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$ and Z^* is an optimal solution for $SDPD_{\mathbf{C}_1''}$. The duality gap being zero implies that $0 = C_{M''}^T Z^* + Tr(F_0 Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} z_{ii}^* + q^*$ which implies further that $q^* = -\sum_{i=1}^{M} z_{ii}^*$.

Now from the equation (33) of [38], the optimality condition

$$Y^* \left(F_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{M} z_{ii}^* F_{ii} + \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} z_{ij}^* F_{ij} + \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} z_{ji}^* F_{ji} \right) = \mathbf{0''}.$$

gives

(i) $X^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^{M} z_{ii}^* \phi_i \phi_i^T + \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} (z_{ij}^* - z_{ji}^*) \phi'_{ij} \right) = 0$
(ii) $z_{ij}^* p_{ij}^* = 0$
(iii) $z_{ji}^* q_{ij}^* = 0$
(iv) $q^* \left(1 - \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} (z_{ij}^* + z_{ji}^*) \right) = 0$

If we assume that $X^* > 0$, the first equality above reduces to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} z_{ii}^* \phi_i \phi_i^T + \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} (z_{ij}^* - z_{ji}^*) \phi'_{ij} = 0.$$

From the definition of $D^+(X^*, q^*)$ and $D^-(X^*, q^*)$, it follows that $z_{ij}^* = 0$ if $(i,j) \notin D^+(X^*, q^*)$ and $z_{ji}^* = 0$ if $(i,j) \notin D^-(X^*, q^*)$. As it is clear that $q^* > 0$, for e.g. due to Welch bound, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{M} (z_{ij}^* + z_{ji}^*) \\ &= \sum_{(i,j) \in D^+(X^*,q^*)} z_{ij}^* + \sum_{(i,j) \in D^-(X^*,q^*)} z_{ji}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem V.1. *For a given unit norm frame $\Phi = \{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^M$, an invertible matrix $\tilde{G}$ is a solution to $C_1^{''}$ if and only if there exist scalars such that $\{\tilde{z}_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^M$ such that the following relations hold*

(i) $\tilde{z}_{ij} = 0$ *for* $(i,j) \notin D^+(\tilde{G}^T\tilde{G}, \mu_{\tilde{G}\Phi})$,
(ii) $\tilde{z}_{ji} = 0$ *for* $(i,j) \notin D^-(\tilde{G}^T\tilde{G}, \mu_{\tilde{G}\Phi})$,
(iii) $\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^M (\tilde{z}_{ij} + \tilde{z}_{ji}) = 1$,
(iv) $\sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{z}_{ii}\phi_i\phi_i^T + \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^M (\tilde{z}_{ij} - \tilde{z}_{ji})\phi'_{ij} = 0$.

It can be noted here that once D^+ and D^- are known, the above conditions give rise to linear system of equations. We can now derive a sufficient condition to obtain a preconditioner that reduces the initial coherence.

Corollary V.2. *For a unit norm frame Φ, the solution to $C_1^{''}$ results in strict decrease in coherence if and only if there do not exists scalars $\{\tilde{r}_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^M$ such that the following relations hold true:*

(i) $\tilde{r}_{ij} = 0$ *for* $(i,j) \notin D^+(\mathbf{I}_m, \mu_\Phi)$,
(ii) $\tilde{r}_{ji} = 0$ *for* $(i,j) \notin D^-(\mathbf{I}_m, \mu_\Phi)$,
(iii) $\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^M (\tilde{r}_{ij} + \tilde{r}_{ji}) = 1$,
(iv) $\sum_{i=1}^M \tilde{r}_{ii}\phi_i\phi_i^T + \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^M (\tilde{r}_{ij} - \tilde{r}_{ji})\phi'_{ij} = 0$.

Proof. As there is a strict fall in coherence, I_m is not a solution to $C_1^{''}$. The result now follows from the previous theorem. □

The above conditions determine a linear system of equalities in the variables $\tilde{r}_{ij}$. According to the corollary, the existence of a preconditioner that results in a strict fall in coherence can be ascertained by checking this system for infeasibility.

Remark V.3. *As ETFs already touch the Welch bound, the associated system of equalities in $\tilde{r}_{ij}$ does not have a solution.*

Remark V.4. *An important issue with the SDP formulation is that there is, in general, no guarantee for the optimal solution G to be non-singular. In practice, however, the primal-dual interior point method described in [38] guarantees the solution at every iteration is non-singular.*

VI. Preconditioner in the Noisy Case

Despite the fact that solving the two linear systems $\Phi x = y$ and $G\Phi x = Gy$ is the same, the error produced by them can differ significantly in the noisy case. i.e. $y = \Phi x + \eta$. The error relation of $\Phi x = y$ and $G\Phi x = Gy$ can be expressed in the following way:

$$\sigma_{\min}(G)\|\Phi x - y\|_2 \leq \|G\Phi x - Gy\|_2 \leq \sigma_{\max}(G)\|\Phi x - y\|_2,$$

where $\sigma_{\min}(G)$ and $\sigma_{\max}(G)$ are minimum and maximum singular values of matrix G respectively. In the presence of noise it is desirable that the condition number $\kappa(G)$ of the preconditioner G remains small. Hence, the relationship between $\kappa(G)$ and $\mu(G\Phi)$ assumes importance. To understand the relationship between the condition number of G and the coherence of $G\Phi$, we introduce two new terms in the convex optimization problem C_1. Since $\kappa(X) = \kappa(G)^2$, the condition number $\kappa(G)$ of G can be controlled by placing restriction on the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of X, which is stated via the following optimization problem:

$$C_2: \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_X & \max\limits_{i\neq j} |\phi_i^T X \phi_j| \\ \text{subject to} & \phi_i^T X \phi_i = 1, \forall i = 1, \ldots, M \\ & t_2 I_m \leq X \leq t_1 I_m, \end{array}$$

where $t_1 \geq t_2 > 0$. It can be noted that C_2 can also be recast as a semi-definite program. As the details are similar to the formulation given previously they are not repeated here. The bounds on $\lambda_{\max}(X)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(X)$ in C_2 imply that $\kappa(X) \leq \frac{t_1}{t_2}$.

Remark VI.1. *It can also be noted that the condition for existence of an optimizer other than the identity matrix follows exactly the same arguments given in Corollary V.2. Hence, it is also possible to ascertain whether there exists a non-trivial solution to C_2 by checking a linear system of equations for infeasibility.*

VII. Experimental Results

In this section we present the numerical results of our proposed method and compare our method to the construction given in [36].

We have carried out our numerical work on Gaussian random matrices $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times M}$. In simulations, we have fixed column size M as 64 and varied row size m from 1 to 63.

To begin with, by solving the convex optimization problem C_1', we have obtained a positive definite matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. To obtain the non-singular matrix G from positive definite matrix X, we have applied Cholesky decomposition on X which results in an incoherent unit norm frame $G\Phi$. In Figure 1, the coherence of Φ (dashed line with circles) and $G\Phi$ (dashed line with stars) depict that the improvement in coherence becomes prominent as m increases. The dotted line with diamond symbol in Figure 1 is the Welch bound.

The recoverability of the sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$ by using the frames $G\Phi$ and Φ is examined through the well known Phase-diagram analysis [6]. In Figure 2, the region below the line with stars (Phase-diagram of $G\Phi$) indicates the recovery region of $G\Phi$ and the region below the line with circles (Phase-diagram of Φ) presents the recovery region of Φ. Therefore, it is clear that $G\Phi$ has better recovery region than Φ.

After obtaining the optimal G via C_1', we have calculated the nearest $\frac{M}{m}-$tight frame $G_1\Phi$ of Φ [15]. In Figure 3, the coherence of $G_1\Phi$ is given by the dash-dotted line with cross marks. We have compared our proposed optimization with the iterative method proposed in [36] which is termed as IUNTF. In Figure 3, the coherence of the incoherent frame obtained via iterative method proposed in [36] is denoted by dash-dotted line with upward triangle. From this figure, it is clear that our proposed method works better for larger m in constructing incoherent frames than the iterative method proposed in [36].



Fig. 1: Aspect ratio vs coherence of frames $G\Phi$ and Φ for different row sizes $m \in \{1, \ldots, 63\}$ for a fixed column size $M = 64$. In addition this plot includes the Welch bound for each frame Φ. This plot demonstrates that proposed method provides better incoherence than its existing counterparts.



Fig. 2: Phase-transition curves for Gaussian sensing frame $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 64}$ where $m \in \{1, \ldots, 63\}$ and its scaled version $G\Phi$. For a give sparsity $s \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ the recovery occurs below the curves. This plot depicts better sparse recovery region for the frames generated by the proposed method C_1'.

The recoverability of a sparse vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$ by using the frames $G_1\Phi$ and Φ is examined through Phase-diagram analysis. In Figure 4, the region below dash-dotted line with upward triangle (Phase-diagram of $G_1\Phi$) indicates the recovery region of $G_1\Phi$ and the region below the line with circles (Phase-diagram of Φ) presents the recovery region of Φ. Therefore it is clear that $G_1\Phi$ has a better recovery region than Φ.

With a view towards analyzing the condition number of preconditioner, we have solved the convex optimization problem C_2 by considering the same Gaussian random matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{63\times 64}$. In C_2, we have fixed t_2 and varied t_1 to obtain a relationship between the coherence of $G\Phi$ and condition number $\kappa(G)$ which is shown in Figure 5. In simulations, we fixed $t_2 = 1$, started with $t_1 = 1$ and gradually incremented t_1 by 0.5. Figure 5 suggests that the coherence of $G\Phi$ decreases as t_1 increases. After certain stage the coherence of $G\Phi$ remains unchanged despite change in t_1. This phenomenon is expected as the coherence of $G\Phi$ touches its minimum values after some iterations, which is described in C_1. Tables 1 and 2 describe a subset of results obtained from the frame $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 64}$ for increasing values of m.

The proposed method solves for $k = 100$ iterations. The running times vary from a few minutes ($m = 1$) to an over two days run ($m = 63$) for fixed column size $M = 64$ on a machine having 32 GB RAM and Intel Xeon processor with speed of 2.20 GHz using CVX in MATLAB.



Fig. 3: Aspect ratio vs coherence of frames $G_1\Phi$ and Φ for different row sizes $m \in \{1, \ldots, 63\}$ for a fixed column size $M = 64$. In addition this plot includes the Welch bound for each frame Φ. This plot demonstrates that the proposed method provides better incoherence than the initial frame.



Fig. 4: Phase-transition curves for Gaussian sensing frame $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 64}$ where $m \in \{1, \ldots, 63\}$ and its scaled version $G_1\Phi$. For a give sparsity $s \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ the recovery occurs below the curves. This plot depicts better sparse recovery region for the frames generated by the proposed method.



Fig. 5: In the plot, the x-axis indicates condition number of a matrix G and the y-axis indicates coherence of the scaled frame $G\Phi$. This plot demonstrates that, as condition number of a matrix G increases the coherence of the scaled frame $G\Phi$ decreases.

TABLE I: Average coherence for 100 iterations of the frames Φ, $G\Phi$ for the frame $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 64}$ with increasing values of m. The Table also includes Welch bound (WB).

m	$\mu(\Phi)$	$\mu(G\Phi)$	WB
6	0.9676	0.9676	0.3917
12	0.8454	0.7709	0.2623
18	0.7407	0.5071	0.2014
24	0.6646	0.3629	0.1627
30	0.6167	0.2757	0.1341
36	0.5563	0.2208	0.1111
42	0.5227	0.1769	0.0912
48	0.5021	0.1403	0.0727
54	0.4694	0.1110	0.0542
60	0.4463	0.0760	0.0325
63	0.4351	0.0529	0.0159

TABLE II: Average coherence for 100 iterations of the frames Φ, $G_1\Phi$ and IUNTF [36] for the frame $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 49}$ with increasing values of m.

m	$\mu(\Phi)$	$\mu(G_1\Phi)$	$\mu(IUNTF)$
6	0.9676	0.9645	0.9860
12	0.8454	0.8429	0.8469
18	0.7407	0.7144	0.7090
24	0.6646	0.6167	0.5948
30	0.6167	0.5328	0.5026
36	0.5563	0.4537	0.4236
42	0.5227	0.3982	0.3671
48	0.5021	0.3537	0.3573
54	0.4694	0.3064	0.5096
60	0.4463	0.2766	0.7575
63	0.4351	0.2703	0.5547

VIII. Conclusion

In this paper, we have studied the effect of preconditioning on sparse recovery properties via frame theory and convex optimization. In particular, we have formulated an optimization problemÂă for improving the coherence of the resulting matrix, which has been solved using techniques from semidefinite programming. When the preconditoner is diagonal, we have obtained analytical conditions for verifying the possibility of strict decrease in coherence. While in the general case, we have provided an analysis of the optimal solution which gives conditions under which strict decrease in coherence is possible.Âă As preconditioners with small condition numbers are desired in the noisy cases, we have given another convex formulation enforcing this constraint. Further, we have discussed the guarantees for strict decrease in coherence in this case. Through simulation results, we have studied the relation between condition number of the preconditioner and its coherence. We have also demonstrated numerically that the proposed method works better than the methods with similar objectives.

IX. Acknowledgment:

The first author is thankful for the support (Ref No. 19-06/2011(i)EU-IV) that he receives from UGC, Govt of India and the second author gratefully acknowledges the support being received from MHRD, Govt. of India. The last author is thankful to CSIR (No. 25(219)/13/EMR-II), Govt. of India, for its support.

References

[1] O. Christensen, "An Introduction to Frames and Riesz Bases," Boston, MA, USA: Birkhauser, 2003.

[2] J. Kovacevic and A. Chebira,"Life beyond bases: The advent of frames(Part I)," IEEE Signal Process. Mag., vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 86-104,Jul. 2007.

[3] A. M. Bruckstein, D. L. Donoho, and M. Elad, "From sparse solutions of systems of equations to sparse modeling of signals and images," SIAM Rev., vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 34-81, 2009.

[4] I. Daubechies, "Ten Lectures on Wavelets," Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 1992.

[5] T. Strohmer and R. W. Heath, "Grassmannian frames with applications to coding and communication," Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 257-275, 2003.

[6] J. L. Massey and T. Mittelholzer, "Observed universality of phase transition in high dimensional geometry, with implications for modern data analysis and signal processing," Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A (2009) 367, 4273âĂŞ4293.

[7] J. A. Tropp, "Greed is good: Algorithmic results for sparse approximation," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2231-2242, Oct. 2004.

[8] P. Viswanath and V. Anantharam, "Optimal sequences and sum capacity of synchronous CDMA systems,"' IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 1984-1991, Sep. 1999.

[9] P. Viswanath and V. Anantharam, "Optimal sequences for CDMA under colored noise: A SchurâĂŞSaddle function property," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1295-1318, Jun. 2002.

[10] R. B. Holmes and V. I. Paulsen, "Optimal frames for erasures,"' Linear Algebra Appl., vol. 377, no. 1, pp. 31-51, 2004.

[11] Y. C. Eldar and G. D. Forney, "Optimal tight frames and quantum measurement," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 599-610, Mar. 2002.

[12] B. G. Bodmann and P. G. Casazza, "The road to equal-norm Parseval frames," J. Funct. Anal., vol. 258, no. 2, pp. 397-420, 2010.

[13] P. G. Casazza, M. Fickus, and D. G. Mixon, "Auto-tuning unit norm frames," Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 1-15, 2012.

[14] M. Fickus, D. G. Mixon, and J. C. Tremain, "Steiner equiangular tight frames," Linear Algebra Appl., vol. 436, no. 5, pp. 1014-1027, 2012.

[15] P. G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok, eds., "Finite frames: Theory and applications", BirkhÂĺauser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2012.

[16] J. Bourgain, S. Dilworth, K. Ford, S. Konyagin and D. Kutzarova, "Explicit constructions of RIP matrices and related problems," Duke Math. J. 159, 145-185, 2011.

[17] E. Candes, "The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing," Comptes Rendus Mathematique, Vol. 346, pp. 589-592, 2008.

[18] E. Candes, J. Romberg and T. Tao, "Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements," Comm. Pure and Appl. Math, 59, 1207-1223, 2006.

[19] E. Candes and T. Tao, "Decoding by linear programming," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 51, 42-4215, 2005.

[20] J. A. Tropp and S. J. Wright, "Computational methods for sparse solution of linear inverse problems," Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 98, no. 6, pp.948-958, 2010.

[21] D. L. Donoho and M. Elad, "Optimally sparse representation in general (nonorthogonal) dictionaries via âĎŞ1 minimization", Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 100, No. 5: 2197 - 2202 (2003).

[22] J. A. Tropp, I. S. Dhillon, R. W. Heath Jr. and T. Strohmer, "Designing structured tight frames via an alternating projection method," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 51, no.1, pp. 188âĂŞ209, 2005.

[23] M. Elad, "Optimized projections for compressed sensing," IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 5695-5702, Dec. 2007.

[24] E. J. Candes and T. Tao, "Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: universal encoding strategies," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 52, no. 2, 489-509, 2006.

[25] S.S. Chen, D.L. Donoho and M.A. Saunders, "Atomic Decomposition by Basis Pursuit," SIAM, Review 43, 129-159, 2001.

[26] D. Donoho, "Compressed Sensing," IEEE Trans. Information Theory, 52, pp 1289-1306, 2006.

[27] D.L. Donoho, M. Elad and V.N. Temlyakov, "Stable Recovery of Sparse Overcomplete Representations in the Presence of Noise," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 52, 6-18, 2006.

[28] Elad. M, "Sparse and Redundant Representations; from theory to applications in signal and image processing," Springer, Berlin, 2010.

[29] Ronald A. DeVore, "Deterministic constructions of compressed sensing matrices," Journal of Complexity, Volume 23,pp 918-925, 2007.

[30] S.Li and G. Ge, "Deterministic Construction of Sparse Sensing Matrices via Finite Geometry," IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing ,Volume 62, Issue 11, June1, 2014.

[31] S. Li, F. Gao, G. Ge, and S. Zhang, "Deterministic construction of compressed sensing matrices via algebraic curves," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 58, 5035-5041, 2012.

[32] A. Amini and F. Marvasti, "Deterministic construction of binary, bipolar and ternary compressed sensing matrices," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 57, 2360-2370, 2011.

[33] C Rusu and N. G. Prelcic "Designing Incoherent Frames Through Convex Techniques for Optimized Compressed Sensing," IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 64(9):1-1 Âů May 2016.

[34] C Rusu, "Design of Incoherent Frames via Convex Optimization," IEEE Signal Processing Letters, VOL. 20, NO. 7, 2013.

[35] E. Tsiligianni, L. P. Kondi, A. K. Katsaggelos, "Construction of Incoherent Unit Norm Tight Frames With Application to Compressed Sensing," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, VOL. 60, NO. 4, 2014

[36] E. Tsiligianni, L. P. Kondi, A. K. Katsaggelos, "Preconditioning for Underdetermined Linear Systems with Sparse Solutions," IEEE Signal Processing Letters, Vol. 22, No. 9, 2015.

[37] J. Cahill, P. G. Casazza and G. Kutyniok, "Operators and frames," Journal of Operator Theory, Volume 70, Issue 1, Summer 2013 pp. 145-164.

[38] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, "Semidefinite Programming," SIAM Review, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 49-95, March 1996.

[39] M. Grant, S. Boyd, and Y. Ye., "Disciplined Convex Programming", in L. Liberti and N. Maculan, eds., Global Optimization:

From Theory to Implementation, Springer, chapter 7, pp.155-210, 2006.

[40] C. Helmberg, F. Rendl, R. J. Vanderbei, and H. Wolkowicz, "An Interior point method for semidefinite programming", J. Optimization, SIAM Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 342-361, May 1996.

[41] B.S. Kashin and V.N. Temlyakov, "A remark on compressed sensing," Matematicheskie Zametki, Vol. 82, No. 6, pp. 829âĂŞ837, 2007.

[42] R. R. Naidu, P. Jampana, C. S. Sastry, "Deterministic Compressed Sensing Matrices: Construction via Euler Squares and Applications," IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 64(14), 2016.